REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the recognition of patentable subject matter in the present application and the withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the previous Office Action. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 102 rejections over Regan for the following compelling reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites *selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures for identifying unidentified ones of the wireless identification devices within a wireless communications range of the reader.* In support of the rejection, the Office relies upon the teachings of Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 51+ of Regan. Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Regan relied upon by the Office only disclose one search procedure for identifying transponders and the 102 rejection is improper for at least this reason.

More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the flow chart of Fig. 2 only provides a single method of identifying transponders. Regan discloses at col. 4, lines 10 that the interrogator 2 transmits at 30 an IDRQ message to which a transponder having that value or combination of values will respond by transmitting its *unique identity code.* Applicants have failed to uncover any other step of the method of Fig. 2 where the transponder is identified. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the method of Fig. 2 only teaches one search procedure and fails to teach the above-recited limitations.

Referring to the TREE teachings, Regan discloses at col. 3, lines 52+ that the interrogator 2 communicates a TREE message in response to which any unidentified transmitter having that value in its first field will transmit a response signal 26.

Applicants have failed to uncover any disclosure in Regan that the response signal 26 includes identification information. To the contrary, the teachings of col. 3, lines 60+ teach that the unique identify code of the transponders is transmitted in response to the IDRQ message 30.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively recited limitations of claim 1 including *using the provided identification information, selecting* **one of a plurality of different search procedures** *for identifying unidentified ones of the wireless identification devices within the wireless communications range* are not disclosed nor suggested by Regan and the 102 rejection is improper for this compelling reason. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 1 in the next Action.

The claims which depend from independent claim 1 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

For example, referring to dependent claim 2, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings in col,. 5, lines 26+ of Regan of the claimed *providing the identification information comprises determining a* *range of identifiers of the wireless identification devices which may be within the wireless communications range* as explicitly claimed. Applicants have electronically searched Regan and failed to uncover any teaching of the limitations of determining a range of identifiers of the devices alone or in combination with the limitations of claim 1 reciting the selecting using the provided identification information as explicitly claimed.

Referring to dependent claim 3, Applicants have failed to uncover in col. 5, lines 19+ any teachings of the claimed limitations of providing the identification information comprises determining a _number of wireless identification devices_ which may be within the wireless communications range. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is allowable.

Referring to dependent claim 36, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings that a transponder of Regan identifies itself responsive to a TREE message but only transmits its unique identification code in response to an IDRQ message as explicitly disclosed in Regan. Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations of a _plurality of different search procedures individually comprise different steps which are performed to identify the at least some of the unidentified ones of the wireless identification devices_ are not taught by the use of the IDRQ message to obtain the identity of the devices and claim 36 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to independent claim 12, the method recites identifying a first of the wireless identification devices within a wireless communications range of the reader, identifying a second of the wireless identification devices within the wireless communications range of the reader, and _selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures using the identifyings_. The Office relies upon the teachings of Regan regarding a TREE message and an IDRQ message as teaching the claimed selecting. However, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings that the communication of a TREE message may be fairly considered to teach a search procedure. In particular, Regan teaches that a unique identification code of a transponder is transmitted in response to an IDRQ message. Applicants respectfully submit that the selecting of

S:\BA4\215\M04.doc   15

claim 12 is not disclosed nor suggested by Regan and the method is allowable for at least this reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 12 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Referring to dependent claim 13, Applicants have failed to uncover any teaching of a *__minimum and maximum identifier__* in col. 4, liens 65+ of Regan relied upon by the Office. Further, Applicants have electronically searched Regan and failed to uncover any teaching of *identifying wireless identification devices having respective ones of a minimum and maximum identifier* alone or in combination with the limitations of claim 12 reciting the *selecting using the identifyings of the wireless identification devices having respective ones of a minimum and maximum identifier.* Applicants respectfully submit claim 13 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to claim 15, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings in Regan of the claimed limitations of *one of the search procedures comprises a __binary search procedure__*, and an *other of the search procedures comprises a __walk-through search procedure__.* Applicants respectfully submit claim 15 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that Regan teaches a single search using an IDRQ message to identify the transponders. The use of the single search fails to teach or suggest the positively-recited limitations of *first selecting __one of a plurality of different search procedures for identifying the wireless identification devices of the first group__, identifying unidentified ones of the wireless*

identification devices of the first group using the selected one of the search procedures,

second selecting <u>an other of the different search procedures</u> using the second

identification information, and <u>identifying unidentified ones of the wireless identification</u>

<u>devices of the second group using the selected other of the search procedures.</u>
Applicants respectfully submit that positively recited limitations of claim 18 are not

disclosed by the prior art and claim 18 is allowable for at least this reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 18 are in condition for

allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as

well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the

cited art.

Referring to independent claim 20, the Office fails to identify any teachings in

Regan of the claimed *processing circuitry configured to analyze a <u>number</u> of wireless*

identification devices <u>which may be present</u> within the wireless communications range

with respect to a range of identifiers of wireless identification devices which may be

present within the communications range. Applicants have failed to locate any

teachings in Regan of these claimed limitations of the processing circuitry and

Applicants respectfully submit claim 20 is allowable for at least this reason.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Regan teaches the use of a

single search using the IDRQ message to identify transponders and fails to teach or

suggest the limitations of the processing circuitry configured to select one of a plurality

of search procedures using the analysis. Claim 20 is allowable for this additional

reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 20 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Referring to claim 21, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings in col. 5 or otherwise of Regan that the *processing circuitry is configured to* <u>*estimate the number of devices*</u> as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that positively recited limitations of claim 21 are not disclosed by the prior art and claim 21 is allowable for at least this reason.

·Referring to claim 23, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings in col. 5 or otherwise of Regan that the *processing circuitry is configured to* <u>*estimate the range of identifiers of devices*</u> as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that positively recited limitations of claim 23 are not disclosed by the prior art and claim 23 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to claim 24, the teachings of col. 4, lines 65+ of Regan fail to teach or suggest the *processing circuitry is configured to estimate the range* <u>*corresponding to minimum and maximum possible values associated with the processing circuitry*</u>. Applicants respectfully submit that positively recited limitations of claim 24 are not disclosed by the prior art and claim 24 is allowable for at least this reason.

Referring to claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that Regan teaches use of the IDRQ message in a single search procedure to identify the transponders which fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the *wireless communications reader is configured to obtain the identity of at least one of the wireless identification devices of the first*

group _using a first search procedure_ and to obtain the identity of at least one of the wireless identification devices of the second group _using a second search procedure different than the first search procedure_. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is allowable for at least this reason.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Regan fails to teach or suggest the claimed _wireless communications reader is configured to_ _select the first and the second search procedures using an analysis of group identification information of respective ones of the first group and the second group_. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is allowable for this additional reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 29 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Referring to independent claim 32, the use of the IDRQ message in a single search procedure of Regan to identify the transponders fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of accessing information regarding a plurality of wireless identification devices _which may be within a communications range of the wireless communications reader_, and _selecting one of a plurality of different search procedures using the accessed information, wherein the different search procedures comprise procedures for identifying unidentified ones of the wireless identification devices._ Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is allowable for this additional reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 32 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as

Appl. No. 10/774,146
Reply to Office Action of July 5, 2007

well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicants hereby add new claims 41-44 which are supported at least by Figs. 3-4 and the associated teachings of the specification.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _10/5/07_   By: _____

James D. Shaurette
Reg. No. 39,833

S:\BA4\215\M04.doc   20